

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS

The following environmental commitments would be implemented as an integral part of the Proposed Action under any of the three route alternatives in the Tropic Valley.

1. Standard Reclamation Management Practices--Standard reclamation management practices would be applied during construction activities to minimize environmental effects and would be implemented by construction personnel or included in contract specifications. Specifically, the amount of open trench allowed during construction and at the end of each workday will be minimized to protect wildlife. Also, workers will be reminded to drive carefully to avoid collisions with wildlife.

2. Additional Analyses--If the Proposed Action were to change significantly from that described in the EA because of additional or new information, additional environmental analyses would be undertaken if necessary.

3. State Stream Alteration Permit--Before implementing the selected alternative, the Company would obtain from the Department of Natural Resources a State Stream Alteration Permit. The conditions and requirements of the State Stream Alteration Permit would be strictly adhered to by the Company.

4. Cultural/Paleontological Resources--Construction personnel would be trained in proper procedures in the event of an inadvertent discovery. Anyone who has inadvertently discovered possible human remains must stop work immediately and contact the National Park Service (435-834-4900) if within the park or Reclamation's archaeologist in the Provo Area Office for all other lands. Work would stop until the proper authorities were able to assess the situation. A "Quick Reference" card explaining the required procedures would be provided by Reclamation to construction workers prior to the start of construction. Instructions for proper procedures in case of inadvertent discovery would be placed in all construction vehicles.

5. Construction Activities Confined to Surveyed Corridor--All construction activities would be confined to the one hundred foot wide surveyed corridor that has been surveyed for cultural and biological resources. Within the Park, only thirty feet of the one hundred foot corridor would be used for construction. Outside of the Park it is expected that only fifty feet of the corridor would be necessary for construction activities.

6. Roads--Existing roads would be used for project activities. No new road construction would be necessary.

7. Disturbed Areas--During construction topsoil would be saved. It would then be redistributed after completion of construction activities. Subsequently, disturbed areas resulting from the project would be smoothed, shaped, contoured, reseeded, and rehabilitated to as near their pre-project construction condition as practicable. Seeding and planting would occur at appropriate times with weed-free seed mixes of native plants. The composition of seed mixes would be coordinated with a wildlife habitat specialist.

Following construction, manpower would be provided by the Tropic and East Fork Irrigation Company to inspect the pipeline alignment within the Park to insure that restoration goals are met. Monitoring and treatment would continue until there are two successive years without human intervention.

8. Visual Resources--Rehabilitation measures would be implemented immediately upon completion of the pipeline. This would include re-contouring and reseeding disturbed areas in a natural appearing way, with native vegetation species. The spread of noxious weeds would be controlled, trash would be cleaned up and construction debris disposed of in designated areas.

9. Air Quality--Best management practices would be implemented to control fugitive dust during construction. The contractor would follow the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's recommended control methods for aggregate storage pile emissions to minimize dust generation, including periodic watering of equipment staging areas, along with dirt and gravel roads. All loads that have the potential of leaving the bed of the truck during transportation would be covered or watered to prevent the generation of fugitive dust. Chemical stabilization would not be allowed.

Construction machinery and operation and maintenance vehicles would be routinely maintained to ensure that engines remain tuned and emission-control equipment is properly functioning as required by law. The contractor would comply with Utah State air quality regulations.

10. Habitat Replacement--A plan to replace wildlife values foregone would be finalized and approved by Reclamation following coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources.

5.0 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

5.1 Introduction

Reclamation's public involvement program gives the public an opportunity to obtain information about a given project and allows all interested parties to participate in these projects through written comments. One of the most important objectives of the program is to obtain information from a well-informed public that would assist decision makers throughout the process and culminate in the implementation of an alternative. This section of the EA discusses public involvement activities undertaken to date for the proposed Tropic Ditch replacement project.

5.2 Public Involvement

Reclamation sent a Scoping Letter on June 13, 2005 to explain the project to interested individuals, groups and stakeholders and to solicit public input regarding the proposed project. Seven responses to the Scoping Letter were received and were considered in preparing this Environmental Assessment.

Coordination between the Bureau of Reclamation and Bryce Canyon National Park has been occurring to discuss pipeline alignment alternatives, cultural resource impacts, and biological resource impacts. Land owners have been involved in the pipeline alignment alternatives selection process. The State Historic Preservation Office and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service have been consulted pursuant to all applicable laws and are involved with all relevant processes. The City of Tropic and Garfield County have also been made aware of the proposed project.

The draft EA was made available for public review and comment in June 2006. Two comment letters were received and were fully considered in preparing this final EA.

5.3 Native American Consultation

Reclamation has conducted Native American consultation throughout the public information process. Reclamation transmitted a letter describing the Proposed Action to the Ute Tribe, the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, the Moapa Paiute Tribe, the Zuni Tribe and the Pueblo of Zuni, the Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians, the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe, the Las Vegas Paiute Tribe, the Shivwits Paiute Band and the Hopi Indian Tribe. This consultation was conducted in compliance with 36 CFR 800.2(c) (2) on a government-to-government basis. Through this effort, each tribe was given a reasonable opportunity to identify any concerns about historic properties; to advise on the identification and evaluation of historic properties, including those of traditional religious and cultural importance; to express their views on the effects of the Proposed Action on such properties; and to participate in the resolution of adverse effects. None of the tribes has identified any issues of concern.

5.4 Paleontological Resources

A paleontological report was requested from the Utah State Geological Survey on June 14, 2005. The record search produced no paleontological resources that would be affected by this project. A letter from the UGS stating such is on file in the Bureau of Reclamation, Provo Area Office.

5.5 Utah State Historic Preservation Office

A copy of the Class III cultural resource report (U-05-MQ-0562b,n,p) has been forwarded to the SHPO. This report includes a project description, the results of the inventory, including maps and a recommendation of determination of effect. Consultation with the Utah SHPO is complete.

6.0 PREPARERS

The following table is a list of the agency representatives and consultants who participated in the preparation of this Draft Environmental Assessment.

Table 6.1 Agency Representatives

Name	Position Title	Contribution
Beverley Heffernan, BA	Environmental Protection Specialist, Bureau of Reclamation, Provo Area Office	Lead Agency Representative
Kristin Legg, MS	Chief of Resource Management and Research, Bryce Canyon National Park	Cooperating Agency Representative
Rafael Lopez, BA	Biologist, Bureau of Reclamation, Provo Area Office	Coordination and Public Involvement
Barbara Boyer, MA	Archaeologist, Bureau of Reclamation, Provo Area Office	Cultural Resources, Indian Trust Assets, Paleontology

Table 6.2 Consultants

Name	Position Title	Contribution
Paul Wright, PE	Senior Engineer, Franson Noble Engineering	Project Manager
Vince Hogge, PE	Engineer, Franson Noble Engineering	Alternatives Analysis
Chad Brown	Engineer, Franson Noble Engineering	EA Coordination Affected Environment Environmental Consequences Environmental Commitments
Tennille Flint	Biologist	Biological Resources
Maggie Peters	Biologist	Biological Resources

7.0 REFERENCES

Bezy, John. 2004. Bryce Canyon: The Story Behind the Scenery. KC Publications, Inc. Las Vegas, NV. 64 pp.

Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, Demographic and Economic Analysis. *Population Projections for Utah's Cities and Unincorporated Areas 2000 - 2030*. Accessed June 1, 2005.
<http://www.governor.utah.gov/dea/publications/2000FinalPublish.pdf>

Hirshmann, Fred. 1991. A Natural History Guide to Bryce Canyon. Published by the Bryce Canyon Natural History Association.

National Park Service. 1996. Resource Management Plan – Bryce Canyon National Park. December 1996.

National Park Service. 2004. Bryce Canyon National Park Fire Management Plan Environmental Assessment.

Parrish, J.R., F.P. Howe, and R.E. Norvell. 1999. Utah Partners in Flight draft conservation strategy. UDWR publication number 99-40. Utah Partners in Flight Program, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, Salt Lake City.

Paukert, C. and R. S. Rogers. 2004. Factors Affecting Condition of Flannelmouth Suckers in the Colorado River, Grand Canyon, Arizona. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 24: 648-653, 2004.

Prairie Dog Coalition – Status of the Utah Prairie Dog. Available at:
<http://www.prairiedogcoalition.org/map/utah-prairie-dog.shtml>. [Accessed August 2006]

Recovery Plan for the Utah Prairie Dog – Available at:
http://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery_plans/1991/910930b.pdf. [Accessed September 2006]

Shakespear, Franz. 2001. Project Proposal Presented to the United States Department of Interior Bureau of Reclamation for the Colorado River Salinity Control Program by the Tropic & East Fork Irrigation Company Box 5 Tropic, Utah 8776.

Bureau of Reclamation. 2005. Bureau of Reclamation Dataweb. Available from:
<http://www.usbr.gov/dataweb/>. [Accessed June 2005].

Bureau of Reclamation, Salinity loading Analysis, Tropic and East Fork Irrigation Company – East Valley Canal Replacement. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2004.

USDA. Fire Effects Information System (FEIS) USDA Forest Service. Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory (Producer). Available from: <http://www.fs.fed.us/database/feis/>. [Accessed June 2005].

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2004. Environmental Assessment for Designation of Critical Habitat for the Mexican Spotted Owl. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 2.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. National Wetlands Data Center. Available from <http://wetlands.fws.gov/>. [Accessed June 2005].

Utah Automated Geographic Reference Center. Geographical Information System Database. Available at <http://agrc.its.state.ut.us/>[Accessed June 2005].

Utah Division of Wildlife Resources website related to Utah Prairie Dogs. Available at: <http://dwrcdc.nr.utah.gov/rsgis2/search/Display.asp?FINm=cynoparv> [Accessed September 2006]

Utah Division of Wildlife Resources. 2005. Conservation Data Center. Available from: <http://dwrcdc.nr.utah.gov/ucdc/>. [Accessed June 2005].

Utah Native Plant Society. 2003-2005. Utah Rare Plant Guide. Salt Lake City, UT: Available from: Utah Rare Plant Guide Home Page. <http://www.utahrareplants.org>. [Accessed June 2005].

Whitfield, Angie. 2005. Cultural Resource Inventory of the Tropic Ditch Salinity Project, Garfield County, Utah. Prepared by Montgomery Archeological Consultants, Moab, Utah for the Bureau of Reclamation Provo Area Office Environmental Group, Provo, Utah. Cultural Resource Report No. 05-207 July.